**Development Management - Delegated Officer Report**

**Application Number:** **AWDM/1485/12** **Recommendation –** Approve

**Site:** 52 Howard Road, Sompting, Lancing

**Proposal:** Construction of front and rear dormer extensions, front rooflights, windows, hip to gable extension and raised decking to rear.

**Date of site visit:** 22 January 2013

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The site relates to a semi-detached bungalow located on the south side of Howard Road, west of its junction with Alandale Road. No. 52 is one of a pair of matching hipped roof semi detached bungalows which have no existing roof extensions.

The ground levels slope steeply down from north to south resulting in a raised floor level at the rear approximately 1 metre above the ground level. The ground level also slopes from east to west with the bungalows stepping down accordingly, resulting in No.52 sitting approximately 0.3m lower than the adjoining bungalow to the east at No. 50. This pattern is repeated throughout the immediate streetscene.

Permission is sought for a hip to gable extension, front and rear dormers, and rooflight windows. French doors have been installed in the side elevation of an existing rear projection and a raised deck and steps are proposed at this point to provide access to the garden at the lower level.

Materials are proposed to match the existing bungalow.

**Relevant site history**
None relevant

**Consultations**

*Sompting Parish Council* have no objections to the proposal.

**Representations**
None received

**Relevant Planning Policies**
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

**Planning Assessment**

**Residential amenity**
Although the roof extensions are relatively large, particularly the rear dormer extension, given the relationship with neighbouring bungalows there would be no significant impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy as a result of these works.

The proposed raised decking area is as a result of the raised floor level at the rear which is a characteristic of the bungalows on the south side of the street. Given the position and scale of the decking the main impact of this would be to the occupiers of No.54 to the west. No.54 has rear windows and a glazed door with stepped access and a side window set at a lower level, all behind a raised boundary wall and gate screening the side window and garden currently. No.52 has no boundary fencing at present between the garden and shared drive although it is clear that the site is currently undergoing renovation work so this may be a temporary measure and a boundary fence of up to 2 metres in height could be erected as permitted development. Given the height of the existing boundary wall at No.54 providing screening, and the limited size of the deck which provides garden access, it is considered acceptable and would not cause any significant loss of privacy.

**Visual amenity**
Although it would not be readily visible in the streetscene, the design of the rear dormer is unsympathetic and would result in a bulky and top heavy appearance to the bungalow and the hip to gable extension would unbalance the appearance of the bungalow in relation to the adjoining bungalow. Amendments were sought but not agreed. However, these alterations or similar as well as rooflight windows could be carried out as permitted development and so this 'fallback' position needs to be taken into consideration.

The front dormer, although fairly box-like, is smaller and would be less dominant in the roofslope than the rear dormer and is similar in size and position to others in the street.

There are many other examples of unsympathetic roof additions in the streetscene and wider area and these proposals would not be significantly harmful to the character of the area and so a refusal on design grounds could not be justified. Therefore on balance, and having regard to the permitted development fallback position, the proposed roof alterations are considered acceptable.

The appearance of the rear decking would be appropriate in its context as a garden structure.

**Recommendation**

**Approve** for the reason:-

Having regard to the permitted development fallback position and taking into consideration the character of the local environment, on balance the proposed development is considered acceptable and can take place without resulting in significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality or unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It consequently would not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

**Subject to Conditions:-**

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing Number CL/001 deposited 4 December 2012

Informative:
The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N**

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 28 January 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 28 January 2013